

THE POEMS OF HAGGAI

BY

PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT

WITTENBERG COLLEGE, SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

CINCINNATI

1928

Off-print from Hebrew Union College Annual, Volume V

*Diss. Baltimore
1928.*

THE POEMS OF HAGGAI

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1918

BY

PAUL FREDERICK BLOOMHARDT

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

1928

*21806



THE POEMS OF HAGGAI*

By PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio

HAGGAI was probably born during the Captivity in Babylon, and came to Jerusalem in one of the smaller groups of returning exiles that followed the first expedition in 537 B.C. The suggestion of Ewald, André, and Cornill, based on 2, 3, that Haggai had seen the former Temple before its destruction in 586 B.C. requires too advanced an age for the poet at the time of his appearance in 520 B.C. There is no evidence that Haggai was a venerable old man in 520 B.C. as Cornill (*Der israelitische Prophetismus*, Lect. 5) says. On the other hand, Havet's statement (*La Modernité des Prophètes*, p. 166) that there was no one left at that time who could have seen the Solomonic Temple, is an exaggeration. It is hardly necessary to add that Havet's assignment of Haggai's poems to the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.) is impossible (see *op. cit.*, pp. 164, 204; cf. Lagarde, *Mitteil.* 4, 365).

Daiches (OLZ † 11, 277) has found a Babylonian equivalent of the name (cf. first of Critical Notes below). There is more

* The translation and restoration of the Hebrew text which follow are based on the interpretation of the Book of Haggai given in the Old Testament Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University under the direction of the late Professor Paul Haupt. Grateful acknowledgment is here made of the writer's indebtedness to him.

† For the abbreviations and diacritical marks see JBL 29, 112; JSOR 1, 3; AJSL 26, 19, 204 and inside front covers in SBOT. Note also:

- André = *Le Prophète Aggée*, Paris, 1895.
- Böhme = *Zu Maleachi und Haggai*, in ZAT, 1887.
- BuL = Bauer and Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*, Halle, 1918.
- CoE = Cornill, *Einleitung in die kanon. Bücher des AT*, 1913.
- DB = Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*.
- EB¹¹ = *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (eleventh edition).
- EdJ = E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, Halle, 1896.

reason to regard him as a layman who was deeply interested in the political conditions of his time, especially the restoration of the political independence of his people, than as a priest (so Reuss and André) who was concerned only with rebuilding the Temple. The allusions in IV, A to the flesh of sacrificial victims and defilement by contact with a dead body could, of course, be made by any layman (cf. the conclusion of Haupt's paper, *Was Amos a Sheepman?* in JBL 35, 287).

In his article *Ancient Babylonian Parallels to the Prophecies of Haggai* (AJSL 35, 128) Bewer has called attention to the first column of Cyl. A of Gudea (c. 2500) where this ancient priest-king of Lagaš is told by the god Ningirsu in a dream, which is interpreted to him by his divine mother Nina, to rebuild the temple of Ningirsu, which had been ruined by a flood; see Witzel's translation in part 1 of his *Keilinschriftliche Studien* (Leipzig, 1918), p. 98. But careful interpretation of the texts gives the impression that parallels between the Gudean inscription and the poems of Haggai are not striking. Haggai, e.g., expected a period of prosperity and political independence with restoration of the Davidic dynasty, rather than the beginning of the Messianic age with the completion of the Temple in which Jhvh would make his home (AJSL 35, 129¹).

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Ehrlich | = <i>Ezekiel und die kleinen Propheten (Randglossen z. hebr. Bibel)</i> , Leipzig, 1912. |
| G ²⁹ | = Gesenius-Bergsträsser, <i>Hebräische Grammatik</i> (29th edition), Leipzig, 1918. |
| GA | = E. Meyer, <i>Geschichte des Altertums</i> , vol. 3, Stuttgart, 1912. |
| IJG ⁵ | = Wellhausen, <i>Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte</i> (5th edition). |
| JB | = Jewish Bible, 1917. |
| Joel | = Haupt, <i>Joel's Poem on the Locusts</i> , in <i>ÆNIA</i> (1911), 381-399. |
| Klosterman | = <i>Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i> . |
| KS | = <i>Keilinschriftliche Studien</i> , Leipzig, 1918. |
| LSAT | = Delitzsch, <i>Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im AT</i> , Berlin, 1920. |
| Michaelis, J.D. | = <i>Deutsche Übersetzung des AT</i> , Göttingen, 1782. |
| Mitchell | = <i>Haggai and Zechariah</i> , in ICC, New York, 1912. |
| Riessler | = <i>Die kleinen Propheten</i> , Rottenburg, 1911. |
| Rothstein | = <i>Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen</i> , 1902. |
| VB | = Jeremias and Winckler, <i>Vorderasiatische Bibliothek</i> , Leipzig, 1907. |
| VG | = Brockelmann, <i>Grundriß der vergleich. Grammatik der semit. Sprachen</i> , 2 vols., Berlin, 1908-1913. |

In the seventeen years that had elapsed between the liberation of the Jews by Cyrus (538 B.C.) and the date of Haggai's appearance (520 B.C.) a succession of bad harvests and poor crops, the levies of passing Persian armies (cf. Wright, *Zech.* 186) as well as heavy taxes within the community during the reconstruction period, and the usual difficulties incident to the re-establishment of the homes and industries of the returned Jews, had greatly impoverished and discouraged them. It was natural, therefore, that the reconstruction of the ruined Temple had not progressed.

The death of Cambyses in 522 B.C. was followed by many insurrections throughout the great Persian empire, and there arose a number of aspirants for the Persian throne. Among these was Darius Hystaspis, who succeeded after three years in establishing himself and quelling all opposition. The dates of the leading events of this period are as follows: On March 11, 522 B.C. began the uprising of Pseudo-Smerdis in Persia. The last date of Cambyses before his death is the 16th of the following month. The assassination of Pseudo-Smerdis and the occupation of the throne by Darius Hystaspis occurred on Sept. 29 of the same year. Darius won his way into Babylon on Dec. 21. During the spring and summer of 521 a number of rebellions in the provinces were put down. Sept. 21, 521 is the first date of Nabû-kudurrî-uçur's revolt in Babylon. The second revolt was not quelled until 519 (HAV 281; GA 3, 194; JBL 33, 161; 32, 107).

The watchful Haggai in Jerusalem believed that he could see in this universal political confusion, before the final success of Darius was assured, the overthrow of the Persian supremacy. With this expected downfall he saw an opportunity to restore the political independence of Jhvh's people under the leadership of the Davidic scion Zerubbabel. For the success of Zerubbabel's political plans he considered the reconstruction of the Temple necessary (JBL 32, 109; 33, 161; 37, 209. 230; AJP 40, 67; *Mon.* 29, 294).

In spite of the consensus of critical opinion that the book is prose throughout, it can be shown that Haggai's genuine words exhibit a distinct meter. Sievers (*Alttestamentliche Miscellen* 6-10 [BSGW 59], pp. 63-75 [1907]) reconstructs the text after a

metrical scheme in which the introductory narrative passages are also included. On the other hand, he thinks that there is no strophic arrangement in Haggai's poems. In Augusti-de Wette's AT (1810) 1, 4-11; 2, 3-9. 14^b-19. 21^b-23 were arranged in lines, and in Bunsens' *Bibelwerk* (1860): 1, 2-11; 2, 3-9. 11-19. 21^b-23. There is no metrical arrangement in RV, JB (except 1, 6), Geo. A. Smith's *Twelve Prophets* (1898), Kautzsch's AT³ (1910), Duhm's *Zwölf Propheten* (1910), Orelli's *Kleine Proph.*³ (1908), or Kittel's *Bibl. Hebr.*² (1913). In Baentsch's posthumous translation of Haggai in *Die Schriften des AT* by Gressmann, Gunkel, &c., part 19 (Göttingen, 1912), p. 76, only the first three lines of II (2, 21^b. 22) are regarded as metrical. Similarly in Hitzig's *Prophet. Bücher* (1854) 2, 22 was arranged in five hemistichs. Budde, *Geschichte der althebr. Literatur* (1906), p. 169, gives a translation of 1, 2-11 in hemistichs, but it is not metrical. Mitchell's reconstruction of some lines (on p. 38 of his commentary) is not satisfactory.

The book contains four poems. The one in c. 1 consists of five triplets with 2 plus 2 beats in each line. The poem at the end of c. 2 is a single quatrain with 3 plus 3 beats. The poem in 2, 1-9 is composed of two quatrains and two triplets, all with 2 plus 2 beats. Of the two poems in 2, 10-19, which were probably delivered on the same day, the first has three couplets with 2 plus 2 beats, while the second consists of four couplets with 3 plus 3 beats. The gloss in 1, 5. 6 also contains a quatrain with 2 plus 2 beats. For the combination in the same poem of stanzas with 2 plus 2 beats and stanzas with 3 plus 3 beats see AJSL 20, 163, n. 2; CoE 506; *Cant.* 52, l. 7; BL 101, l. 1. Haupt (JBL 32, 107; 33, 161) has advanced the theory that Zechariah 8, 9-17 and 7, 1-3 plus 8, 18. 19^a plus 7, 4-6 plus 8, 19^b contain two poems of Haggai.

The narrative passages (1, 1. 12. 14; 1, 15 and 2, 20; 2, 1. 2. 10. 11) have been added by another hand. Because of their resemblance to Zech. 1, 1. 7; 7, 1-3; 8, 18; Ezr. 1, 1 and Neh. 1, 1; 2, 1 they may be ascribed to the Chronicler (350 B.C.) to whom the compilation of Ezra and Nehemiah is usually assigned; cf. JBL 40, 119. It is probable that he merely enlarged upon dates that were attached to each poem not long after its

utterance and were thereafter associated with it. Budde (*Althebr. Lit.* 169) thinks that Haggai's poems were edited by a disciple, who also provided the historical introductions, dates, &c., just as Jeremiah's poems were written down by Baruch.

TRANSLATION

I

LET NOT THE TEMPLE LIE IN RUINS!

(Aug. 28, 520 B.C.)

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---|--|
| i | 1, 2 | ^a Thus said Jhvh, ^β
[The time is] not [come]
4 ^γ Is it time for yourselves | These people say,
to build Jhvh's house.
to dwell under ^δ cover? ^ε |
| ii | 7 | ^ζ Consider now, ¹
9 ^a Ye looked for much,
What ye brought home, | how ye have fared: ²
and lo! it is little; ³
I blew upon it <.> ⁴ |
| iii | 9 ^b | Why is that so?
On account of my house, ⁵
While ye are running | says Jhvh Sabaoth.
which lies in ruins, ⁶
for your own houses. ⁷ |
| iv | 10
11 | Therefore { } the heavens
I called a drought { ^ι }
And on the grain, | withheld "their" dew. ^{8δ}
on *land and ^λ mounts, ⁹
and the new wine. ¹⁴ |
| v | 8
13 | Go up to the mountain, ¹⁰
And build the house!
^ξ I ¹³ am with you, | and <cut down> timber, ¹¹
Then I'll show my glory. ^{12ν}
says Jhvh <Sabaoth>. ⁹ |

(α) 1, 1 In the second year of King Darius,¹⁴ in the sixth month, on the first day of the month,¹⁵ came Jhvh's word through¹⁶ the prophet¹⁷ Haggai to Zerubbabel^{18 ππ} as follows

(β) 2 Sabaoth, as follows

(γ) 3 Jhvh's word came through the prophet Haggai as follows¹⁹

(δ) 4 your houses (ε) while this house is in ruins²⁰

III

BE NOT DISMAYED!

(Oct. 17, 520 B.C.)¹

- A i 2, 3 ^αWho is left among you that saw (with his eyes)
 This house (of God) in its former glory?²
 What do ye see now (in its place)?
 Is not its appearance like naught in your eyes?³
- ii 4 Now take thou courage,⁴ O Zerubbabel!^{βγ}
 And { } all ye people! says Jhvh 'Sabaoth'.
 {Take courage} and work! for I am with you;^δ ^ε
 5 My spirit abides among you, fear not!⁵
- B iii 6 ^ζAfter a little I'll shake once more⁶
 ^ηHeaven and ^θearth and 'sea and *dryland.⁷
 7 I'll 'destroy' ^ιthe nations and ⁸treasure's⁹ will come in.^{ιι}
- iv 8 Mine is the silver¹⁰ and mine is the gold.^ν
 9 Yea, great will be the^ξ Temple's °glory.^π
 And in this place I'll give¹¹ prosperity.^{ρσ}

- (α) 2, 1 In the seventh month, on the twenty-first day of the month,¹²
 2 Jhvh's word came through the prophet Haggai^{ττ} ¶ to Zerubbabel^{υυ}
 and to <all> the remnant of the people as follows
- (β) 4 says Jhvh (γ) Take courage, O high-priest Joshua ben-Jehozadak!
 (δ) says Jhvh Sabaoth
- (ε) 5 the word which I pledged to you when ye came forth from Egypt¹³
 (ζ) 6 for thus said Jhvh Sabaoth (η) the (*accus.*) (θ) the (*accus.*)
 (ι) the (*accus.*) (κ) the (*accus.*) (λ) 7 all
 (μ) 7 from all the nations, and I shall fill this Temple with glory, said
 Jhvh Sabaoth
- (ν) 8 says Jhvh Sabaoth (ξ) 9 this (ο) future
 (π) 9 above the former, said Jhvh Sabaoth (ρ) says Jhvh Sabaoth
 (σ) 'that is, peace of mind and preservation for every one who lays the
 foundations for re-erecting this Temple'¹⁴

(ττ) 2, 1. 2 as follows: Say

(υυ) ben-Shealtiel, the governor of Judah, and to the high-priest Joshua ben-Jehozadak

IV

A LITTLE RELIGION IS NOT SUFFICIENT

(Dec. 18, 520 B.C.)¹

- A i 2, 12 ^a "If" a man should carry holy flesh² in ^b his garment,
And touch with the skirt some^c bread, or ^d pottage,
- ii Or ^e wine, or oil, or any kind of food,
Would that become holy?³ ^c They [will] say, No.
- iii 13 ⁷ But if ye touch a corpse,⁴ and then any of these,
Would they be unclean?⁵ The priests⁶ [will] say, Yes.⁷
- B iv 14 ⁸ So⁸ it is with these people⁹ before me,
declares Jhvh 'Sabaoth'.
And so it is with their handiwork:¹⁰
what they offer there is unclean!
- v 15 Consider now (the time)¹¹
from this day going backward,¹²
Ere stone was joined to stone¹³
in the Temple,* 'how did ye fare then?'
- vi 16 Ye would come to a heap¹⁴ of twenty
and 'lo!' there were but ten;
When ye came¹⁵ to draw fifty (measures)
'from' a vat,¹⁵ there were but twenty.¹⁶
- vii 18 ⁷ The time from the day¹⁶ when was founded
'the' Temple,¹⁵ now consider!
19 Is the seed-grain yet¹⁷ in the pit?¹⁸
are the grape-vines¹⁹ [yet] unbearing?²⁰

(α) 2, 10 On the twenty-fourth day of the ninth²¹ month²² Jhvh's word
11 came to²² the prophet Haggai as follows: Thus said Jhvh Sabaoth,
Ask the priests²³ for instruction²⁴ as follows

(β) 12 the skirt of (γ) the (δ) the (ε) the
(ζ) the priests [will] answer (η) 13 and Haggai said

(ð)	2, 14	and Haggai began and said	(i) So it is with this nation and
(κ)	15	of Jhvh	(λ) 16 to the winepress
(λ)	14, 17	and they were grieved because of their labor ²⁵ , ²⁵ I have smitten you with blight, and with mildew, and with hail, ²⁶ yet <ye do not come> to me, says Jhvh ²⁶	
(ν)	18	Consider now from this day going backward ²⁷	(ξ) of Jhvh
(ο)	19	and the figs and the pomegranates and the olive trees	
(π)		from this day I will bless ²⁷	

(ρρ)	2, 10	in the second year of Darius	
(σσ)	14	<because of their acceptance of bribes> ²⁸	
(ττ)		<and their hatred of a pleader in court> ²⁹	(υυ) 17 all your handiwork
(φφ)	18	from the twenty-fourth day in the ninth month ³⁰	

EXPLANATORY NOTES

I

(1) Lit. *set your heart on your ways*; AV *consider your ways*. This phrase, however, does not mean, Consider what you are to do in the future, but what you have experienced in the past. St. Jerome (cited by Orelli) says: *Considerate et in memoriam redigite quae feceritis et quae passi sitis*.

(2) The command in v. 8 interrupts the argument in vv. 7. 9 and belongs after v. 11 (Sievers).

(3) Hardship, misfortune, and crop-failure had resulted instead of the fulfillment of the large expectations which the Jews had brought with them from Babylon as portrayed in Pss. 122. 126 (AJSL 11, 80. 134). To the people, existing prospects seemed no better than those of previous years.

(4) *I blew upon it* does not mean *I blew it away* (so AV^M, also J. D. Michaelis, and Orelli; Luther, *ich zerstäube es*) or *I pooh-pooed it*, I despised it, it is insignificant like wind-driven chaff, but *I blasted it*. The poet's intention was not to show Jhvh's contempt for their poor harvests but to emphasize the fact that these were due to His anger. *Blast* denotes not only *blowing*, but also *blight*, curse. Grotius comments, *Ita perire feci sicut perit emissus halitus*. In the story of Aladdin the slave of the lamp breathes upon the vizier's son so that he becomes paralyzed. In ath-Tha'labi's (died A.D. 1038) *Stories of the Prophets* (AJSL 14, 150, l. 3) Job's leprosy is said to have been caused by Satan blowing

into his nostrils a blast which turned his body white. Marti quotes the Arabian superstition mentioned by Bauer: It is in the highest degree disagreeable to Moslems if any one whistles over a threshing floor heaped with grain. Then comes the devil, they say, in the night and takes part of the harvest.

(5) The people contended that the Temple could not be rebuilt because of the hard times. Haggai asserts that the hard times are due to Jhvh's displeasure because the Temple was allowed to lie in ruins. The poet implies that prosperity will come as soon as indifference to the Temple's condition ceases.

(6) Cf. 2 K 25, 9, 13; 2 Chr. 36, 19. Soon after the Return, the altar of burnt-offering was erected, if it was not already standing when the Jews arrived; but apart from this, little work had been done on the heaps of stone and charred timbers that marked the Temple site (see n. 26).

(7) The Hebrew verb, which means *to run*, *to hasten*, and in Assyrian, *to succor*, corresponds to our colloquial *to hustle*: ye are active and energetic in the interest of your own houses, but not for my house. Grotius: *vestras res tantum agitis. Deum non curatis, nec ille vos curat.*

(8) During the Palestinian dry season (May to September) nightly sea-breezes, heavily laden with moisture, precipitate it as thick mist on the summer crops of millet, sesame, figs, melons, grapes, olives, &c. In the summers preceding August 28, 520 B.C. these west winds had been irregular and interspersed with hot sirocco winds from the east, destructive to crops.

(9) The drought was universal. It affected lowlands and highlands, and touched such different growths as grain and grapes. Even the wooded hills, nature's reservoirs, were dry (cf. Am. 1, 2).

(10) For timber it was not necessary to go to distant Lebanon, famous for cedars, nor even as far as Carmel which was also thickly wooded; neighboring hillsides afforded all the timber that the limited means and strength of the little community could utilize. In Haggai's time there must have been woodland in the vicinity. Cf. Neh. 2, 8; 8, 15. *Mountain* here practically means *forest*. Caesar (*Bell. Gall.* 6, 25) uses *Hercynia silva* for the forest-covered mountain system of Germany from

the Black Forest to the Carpathians (cf. JBL 36, 249). Cf. also Goethe's *Füllest wieder Busch und Tal* (for *Berg und Tal*). Heb. *śadê*, field, is Assy. *śadû*, mountain; Heb. *ḥorš*, thicket, is Assy. *ḥuršu*, mountain; Heb. *dobr*, steppe, is Eth. *dabr*, mountain. Haggai meant, Go out to the wooded hills! Contrast Morgenstern's *the Temple mount* in his paper *On Leviticus 10*, 3 in the Haupt Anniversary Volume (Baltimore and Leipzig, 1926), p. 99.

(11) Building stone could be found in the Temple ruins and the devastated city; cf. 2, 15; Ezr. 6, 4. Timber was needed for the framework and roof.

(12) Lit. *then I'll take pleasure in it and glorify myself*. Grotius: *placebit mihi in ea domo ostendere majestatem meam*. As long as Jhvh had no Temple in Jerusalem, He could not dwell among his people and manifest his glory.

(13) V. 13 interrupts the narrative section that follows the poem, and many regard it as a gloss. Sievers inserts a modified form of v. 13^a between vv. 8 and 12 and rejects v. 13^b. V. 13^b, however, contains a sentiment corresponding to v. 8^b and may be the missing line of the triplet and a fitting conclusion to the first poem (cf. ZAT 26, 13, l. 4).

(14) Darius Hystaspis, 521–485 B.C. The passage 2, 3 would be meaningless at a later date, and the political situation described in 2, 6. 7. 21. 22 corresponds to that which existed when Darius Hystaspis ascended the Persian throne. Riessler's view that Darius represents Cambyses, and that Zerubbabel was identical with Nehemiah and the first Persian governor of Judea, is impossible (cf. JBL 32, 107, n. 1; 111, n. 13).

(15) Aug. 28, 520 B.C. Cf. HAV 290; GA 3, 195; JBL 33, 161. The Babylonian year of twelve lunar months consisted of 354 days. The first year of Darius, 521 B.C., contained a thirteenth or leap-year month of thirty days. Strassmaier (*Camb.* 400) has shown that the dark of the moon which was observed on Dûzu 14th in the seventh year of the reign of Cambyses, occurred July 16/17, 523 B.C. If the 1137 days from Dûzu 14, 523 to Elul (sixth month) 1, 520 be added to the Julian date of July 16/17, 523 for the former, the date of Haggai's first poem must be Aug. 28/29, 520 B.C. The first of Elul was a holiday (Is. 66, 23; Am. 8, 5)

and the poem was delivered before such a group of people as would assemble about a speaker on a day of this kind.

(16) Lit. *by the hand of* (cf. 2, 1). The divine message was communicated to the people through this channel. In 2, 10. 20 the communication is to the prophet only, presupposing that it was to be passed on to others.

(17) Haggai was a patriotic poet like Amos, Hosea, and Micah. Heb. *nabî* means not *foreteller* but *caused to speak, inspired* (TOCR 1, 271). CD (s.v. poetry) cites Bailey's line in the proem to *Festus*: *Poetry is in itself a thing of God; He made His prophets poets.*

(18) Zerubbabel, as Albright suggests, may be a late erroneous vocalization, based upon a popular etymology of the name. Originally it was *Zêrbâbêl*, Babylonian *Zêr-Bâbili*, meaning *Offspring of Babylon*, and a common formation in Babylonian (JBL 40, 108). Vocalizations based on popular etymology are very common, and have been collected by Böhl in an important paper on *Wortspiele im Alten Testament*, JPOS 6, 196-212, and in his brochure *Volksetymologie en Woordspeling in de Genesis-verhalen*. *Zerûb-babel* is a monstrosity, quite without parallel (Contrast Haupt, JBL 32, 108).

Zerubbabel was the Davidic scion on whom the Jewish hopes for the restoration of their political independence centered; he was the grandson of the last legitimate king of Judah, Jehoiachin (1 Chr. 3, 17; 2 K 24, 8) who was eighteen years old when he was carried captive to Babylon, and fifty-five when released by Evil-Merodach (2 K 25, 27). At that time he may have been allowed to establish a harem, so that he had seven sons. At his death his eldest son, Shealtiel, it may be supposed, was recognized as head of the Jews. It is possible that neither Shealtiel nor the second son, Malchiram, had sons and that the Zerubbabel who was heir to the throne was born to the third son, Pedaiah (1 Chr. 3, 19). Albright's conjecture (JBL 40, 108) that both Shealtiel and Pedaiah were fathers of sons bearing the name Zerubbabel, more easily solves the apparent discrepancy indicated in n. 27 below. The great joy that would arise among the exiles when an heir to the throne was born about 538 B.C. is pictured in Is. 9, 6 (JBL 32, 108; 35, 283; OLZ 12, 67; AJP 40, 67:

Mon. 29, 299). The babe Zerubbabel was taken with those who returned to Jerusalem in 538 B.C. under the permission of Cyrus. The boy was probably under the protection of his uncle Sheshbazzar whom E. Meyer (EdJ 75; see also *Ezra-Nehemiah*, SBOT, 58, 14) and Albright (JBL 40, 108 f.) identify with Shenazzar, the fourth son of Jehoiachin. Albright proposes *Šin-ab-ušur*, a common neo-Babylonian name (cf. Meyer's *Šin-bal-ušur* and contrast Torrey's view, AJSL 37, 93, n. 1) as the common original for both Shenazzar and Sheshbazzar. Shenazzar may have died as Zerubbabel was approaching manhood in 521 B.C., and perhaps one of the first official acts of Darius was the appointment of the eighteen year old Zerubbabel to succeed his uncle as governor of Judah.

(19) V. 3 is a useless repetition of part of v. 1, and interrupts the argument in vv. 2. 4.

(20) V. 4^b arose from v. 9^b.

(21) VV. 5^a and 7^a are monotonous repetitions of v. 2^a. VV. 5^b. 6 are amplifications of vv. 7^a. 9^a.

(22) André interprets the Hebrew term as a little perforated stone which indicated that its wearer was a serf, but it refers to a leaky purse. Grotius compares the sieves of the Danaïdes. Because of the high prices, money had lost its value, and even the well-paid laborer could buy no more than before. The conditions of 520 B.C. were paralleled by those that followed shortly after the World War. Necessities cost so much that, no matter how often purses are filled, their contents quickly disappear.

(23) V. 11^b is a detailed prosaic account of the drought's effects, and may represent an accretion of glosses.

(24) The *remnant* does not refer to those left in the land after the deportation in 586, nor to their descendants, but to the few who had survived the Captivity, and had returned to Judah, and had not succumbed to the ensuing hardships.

(25) Not *fear* (AV) of punishment by Jhvh, but reverential awe manifested in obedience and respect.

(26) Neither Haggai nor Zechariah know of any previous work on the Temple. Ezr. 5, 16 is unsupported by evidence or probability, and Ezr. 3, 8-10 is much confused. Hölscher (*Die Propheten*, 334) suggests, on the basis of Jer. 41, 5, that even

the altar of burnt-offering had been erected during the period of the Captivity by Jhvh-worshipers who were left behind. Débris may have been removed; the foundations would not have been destroyed, and may have needed only repairs before the super-structure could be begun.

(27) Shealtiel is named as Zerubbabel's father in Matt. 1, 12; Luke 3, 27; Ezr. 3, 8; 5, 2; Neh. 12, 1 and throughout Haggai; but in 1 Chr. 3, 19 Zerubbabel is named as the son of Pedaiah. See note 18 above.

(28) Joshua was the grandson of Seraiah (1 Chr. 6, 14; **M** 5, 40) who was slain at Riblah in 586, and son of Jehozadak who went into the Captivity. Joshua may have been the first high-priest, the theocratic head of the congregation only after the removal of Zerubbabel in 519. The introductory lines are later than 519. Joshua may represent a subsequent addition. Haggai addressed his poem to Zerubbabel, not to Zerubbabel and Joshua (JBL 32, 113, l. 7; 37, 210; JSOR 2, 78). The statement *and to the high-priest Joshua ben-Jehozadak* must be regarded as an unhistorical tertiary addition. S. E. Cook (EB¹¹ 1, 4^a) says, Several difficulties in the present Biblical text appear to have arisen from the attempt of later tradition to find a place for Aaron in certain incidents.

(29) This gloss may have been inserted in order to prevent the misunderstanding that Haggai was an Angel of Jhvh (so Ehrlich). Heb. *mal'ak* and Gr. ἄγγελος mean both *messenger* and *angel*. The addition does not imply that Haggai and Malachi are the same person (so Cheyne, *Crit. Bibl.* 179).

(30) V. 12^b was probably added to avoid the impression that the people had actually heard the voice of Jhvh (cf. ZDMG 63, 513, l. 13; Deut. 4, 12; John 5, 37).

II

(1) Both André and Böhme felt that the text of the second chapter had been disturbed. Haupt (JBL 32, 113; 37, 211; JSOR 2, 76) suggests that the poem at the end of the book (2, 20-23) originally followed the first poem; 1, 15 must be combined with 2, 20 to provide the date of this utterance. VV. 21-23 breathe a spirit of revolution against the Persian

supremacy, and express the hope that in the midst of the overthrow of the Persian power, the Davidic scion Zerubbabel will restore the political independence of Jhvh's people. Because of its revolutionary character it was probably suppressed after the power of Darius had been established; see above, p. 155. At a later date, probably after the fall of the Persian empire, the poem was appended at the end, since it exhibits the same meter as the preceding lines in vv. 14-16. 18. 19, and also because it formed a more pleasing conclusion to the book, just as Ezra-Nehemiah originally followed Chronicles, which later were given the concluding place in the canon in order to end it with the hopeful outlook of 2 Chr. 36, 23 (cf. Grimm's *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendices*, p. 1).

The rebuilding of the Temple was advocated by Haggai for political purposes. The desire for national independence was strong. Hopes for it were encouraged by the world situation at the death of Cambyses and the grapple for the Persian throne by Darius and others. The result in Judah was a political rebellion, with Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah by favor of the Persians, at its head. Haggai visualizing the world turmoil, lends his support to Zerubbabel. Less than a month after his first address he speaks again to prophesy the success of the rebellion and the exaltation of Jhvh's Chosen, Zerubbabel. According to Haupt, Ps. 21 (to which Ps. 24, 7-10 should be appended) glorifies the coronation of Zerubbabel. Also Pss. 20, 110, 132; 1 S 2, 1-10; Is. 9, 5. 6; 11, 1-6; Mic. 5, 1. 3; Luke 1, 68-79 refer to this Davidic scion (JBL 33, 167; 37, 213. 231; JSOR 2, 81; AJP 40, 69. 72. 74; ZDMG 58, 621; Mic. 10; Mon. 29, 296, 301, 305).

(2) V. 21 does not refer to a seismic disturbance, but is a poetical figure for the overthrow of the great powers of the earth which in 520 B.C. were the Persian government and its gods (cf. note 7 on III and JBL 37, 282¹). These were apparently tottering to a fall in the confusion that followed the death of Cambyses (cf. JBL 32, 108).

(3) Lit. *throne of kingdoms*, an intensive plural referring to the dominion of the world-wide Persian empire.

(4) Jewish hopes need not be limited by the puny strength of their little community. Jhvh's power, believed to be operating

at the very moment in causing the confusion and dissension within the great Persian empire, was expected by Haggai to bring about its utter destruction (cf. Jud. 7, 22; Ezek. 38, 21; Zech. 14, 13; 2 Chr. 20, 23). Jhvh's hand was at work, and ultimately would set up Jerusalem as His dwelling place, the center of world control (JBL 32, 109-112. 115. 120).

(5) Zerubbabel was to signify to all the world all the authority and favor which a signet ring of Jhvh's hand would carry (cf. Gen. 41, 42; Est. 3, 10; 8, 2). Sellin, *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus* (1912), p. 179, n. 1, says that the Cherub is called in Ezek. 28, 12 a *signet*; but this passage is very uncertain; see *Ezekiel* (SBOT) 85. 39. 42; Kautzsch's AT³ 1, 899, note a. Ezek. 28, 12^b-16 seems to be an illustrative mythological quotation; cf. Is. 14, 12. Sellin's explanation of the obscure phrase in Ezek. 28, 12, rendered in JB: *thou seal most accurate*, is just as questionable as his interpretation (*op. cit.*, p. 178) of the epithet in Is. 9, 6, translated in RVM: *Father of Eternity* (cf. AJP 40, 72; Mon. 29, 302). For *signet* as a symbol of something precious and dear cf. Jer. 22, 24; Cant. 8, 6; see Haupt, BL 109; Grapow, *Vergleiche im Ägyptischen* (1920), p. 19. For Cant. 8, 6 also compare the lines in Tennyson's poem *The Miller's Daughter*; She is grown so dear, that I would be the jewel that trembles in her ear; and I would be the girdle about her dainty waist and I would be the necklace upon her balmy bosom.

(6) All the Versions count 1, 15^a as the first verse of c. 2, and in the Received Text there is a lesser pericopic division between vv. 14 and 15. Rothstein and Klosterman believe that a passage has fallen out of the text after v. 15. The date in 1, 15 is one which the utterance in 2, 21-23 would suit admirably; the same day of the month is referred to in 2, 20; and the poem in 2, 20-23 is the only one of the four in the book whose attached date lacks mention of the month. What appears as a useless appendage after 1, 14 serves well before 2, 20-23.

(7) Twenty-three days after the date in 1, 1 (see n. 15 on I), *i.e.* Sept. 20, 520 B.C.

(8) See n. 16 on I.

(9) André correctly assigns v. 21^a to the final redactor who conformed the verse to 1, 1 and 2, 2 on the basis of the address

to Zerubbabel in 2, 23. Note the omission of Joshua here; see note 28 on I.

(10) Zerubbabel, chosen for the throne of David.

(11) This addition was probably made by a late glossator who believed the twenty-fourth referred to the ninth month in 2, 10. 18. Cf. the translation of Josh. 5, 2 in the Polychrome Bible and Zech. 4, 12 (JBL 32, 121, 11) as well as *Est.* 22, 14; IJG⁵ 276, n. 5.

III

(1) After seven weeks of work on the Temple the people grew discouraged at the slow progress of its reconstruction. The enthusiasm which marked the beginning of their labors (1, 14) waned, as they became aware of the limited resources of the little community, the restrictive effect of withdrawing workers from productive occupations, and the contrast between the glory of the former Temple and the one which their hands were erecting. Nor had there yet appeared a fulfillment of the prediction of Zerubbabel's exaltation which had been made four weeks before. Haggai saw the necessity of re-establishing the *morale* of the workers.

(2) The Temple had been destroyed sixty-six years before by Nebuchadnezzar (2 K 25, 9. 13). A very few men, seventy-five or eighty years old, could have remained to tell from personal remembrance, of the glory of those bygone days. That their reminiscences would be idealized, and that they would be pessimistic with regard to the times at hand, would be more or less characteristic of their old age. The effect on the public mind of such disparaging remarks was detrimental to the purpose of completing the work.

(3) This comment was doubtless quite familiar to the ears of the people, and was mentioned by the poet, not for emphasis of its truth, but as an introduction which would catch the public attention, and from which he could proceed to combat the discouragement which it caused.

(4) Do not spend time in vain and disquieting comparisons! Take courage and work!

(5) There is no reason for discouragement. Jhvh, abiding among them would beyond a doubt supply all that they might fail to accomplish. Cf. Is. 9, 7 (*Mon.* 29, 302; AJP 40, 72).

(6) The prediction in 2, 21-23 had not been fulfilled. Doubts concerning it had arisen. So Haggai says: Have faith *only a little while longer*; Jhvh has shattered the powers of the world before, and he will do it again *after a little while*. The Hebrew phrase at the beginning of this triplet means lit. *yet once a little it or once more a little it is*, i.e., the Persian empire was shaken by rebellions in various provinces at the beginning of the reign of Darius. These insurrections have been crushed. But soon the empire will be shaken again by new uprisings, and this will enable you to regain your political independence (JBL 32, 108). J. D. Michaelis' (1782) rendering (*once more, but only for a short time*) is incorrect; he referred this prediction to Alexander the Great's overthrow of the Persian empire in 331. The same misinterpretation was given by Döderlein in his edition of Grotius' *Annotationes* (1776).

(7) V. 6 does not refer to a physical catastrophe, but to the religious and political upheaval that was taking place over the world, and to battles on land and sea (see n. 2 on II). The hemistich *and sea and dry land* is not a prosaic gloss, as Mitchell thinks.

(8) The same Hand that was destroying the nations will cause these events to bring about the enrichment of Jerusalem, His chosen dwelling place. Rich spoil will flow into the city, when Zerubbabel becomes victorious with Jhvh's aid. The Maccabees provide a parallel 350 years later; cf. Ps. 68, 14. 31 (AJSL 23, 229, n. 21 and 236, n. 48).

(9) The Received Text has the singular, which the Vulgate and Luther explain as referring to the Messiah. The Versions have the plural, and in the Received Text (in which the word, though singular, is accompanied by a plural verb) it can be pointed as a plural without the change of a single consonant. It refers, as the following verse indicates, to the riches that will be gotten from the heathen who are to be subdued by Jhvh's power.

(10) This statement is not declarative of Jhvh's ownership of valuable metals in use or unmined, but is anticipatory of the riches that were to flow into the city when Jhvh's plans for Zerubbabel were fulfilled.

(11) The Temple's humble beginnings will finally be clothed with glory, and the people's poverty will be replaced with pros-

perity. In Is. 9, 6 Zerubbabel is called the Prince of Weal, *i.e.* prosperity (*Mon.* 29, 302; *AJP* 40, 69).

(12) Oct. 17, 520 B.C., the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles (*Ezek.* 45, 25; *Lev.* 23, 34) of which no mention is made here. Its celebration may have been much less elaborate in 520 B.C. than usual because of the poor harvests and other troubles.

(13) V. 5^a is lacking in all the Versions but the Vulgate, and is rejected by nearly all critics. The glossator was probably thinking of a passage like Ex. 3, 12, and meant to say: Remember *the promise which I gave you when you came out of Egypt*. Cf. also *Jer.* 7, 23; *Ex.* 19, 5. 6.

(14) *Peace of mind*, *i.e.* security; *preservation*, *i.e.* safety; if they start to lay the foundations of the new Temple, they will not be disturbed and endangered. This gloss to the final word of the second poem is preserved in the Greek. We need not suppose that it is based on *Ezr.* 9, 9^b.

IV

(1) Work on the Temple again lagged, and shrugging shoulders reappeared, when Haggai's extravagant promises of October failed to materialize within the following two months; so he renewed his efforts to inspire the people with enthusiasm. A new kind of appeal was necessary. This time his approach was on the basis of the religious significance of the new Temple.

(2) That is, the meat of a sacrificial victim.

(3) Does holiness spread easily? Does it pass from one object through another to a third? Any one in the crowd familiar with the common ideas of ceremonial contagion knew that the only reply was, No.

(4) Cf. *Num.* 19, 11–22 (P). Aversion among Orientals to a dead body and the ceremonial defilement of all that touches it is well known.

(5) Does pollution spread easily? Will it spread through an intermediate object or person to a third?

(6) A layman might have hesitated to put aside a valuable skin-bottle of wine that had accidentally been touched by one who had been near a corpse, but every one knew that in such

a case the verdict of the priests would be, Unclean. A layman may be inclined to disregard the rules of quarantine for contagion, but every one knows that any physician will insist on them where a contagious disease exists. As no one needs actually to inquire for the physician's opinion on such a matter, so Haggai's hearers did not actually consult the priests.

(7) The implication in these two questions may be illustrated by the fact that a single disease germ may affect an entire community, but a great amount of disinfectant is required to eradicate an epidemic that has once spread.

(8) The pause that followed vv. 12. 13 made their *argumentum ad hominem* more impressive, and served to separate their dialectic from the exposition that follows. The following lines have three beats in each hemistich, not two as in the preceding three couplets; cf. *Cant.* 14, no. 10, ii and p. 52; BL 101, l. 1.

(9) The people were living without a center of ceremonial and moral cleansing, the Temple, while they were continually in contact with the defiling foreign influences of their day. The altar of burnt-offering did not afford a place strong enough to make the true religion of Jhvh a real influence. Only the reconstructed Temple could dominate their minds. When it had been built, they would be proud that they were Jews, and keep themselves ritually clean.

(10) Their defilement had contaminated their handiwork to such a degree that when they brought the product of their labor before Jhvh, it did not please Him, and He had therefore not prospered them.

(11) Contrast 2, 4 (n. 2 on III). Haggai here directs attention to the past instead of to the future. Such work as had been done on the Temple was being accompanied by evidences of the return of Jhvh's favor.

(12) Lit. *upward*; cf. our expressions, *to trace the stream upward, down to the present time, high antiquity*. The primary connotation of the Hebrew term for eternity ('*ôlām*) is *highness*, i.e. *high antiquity*, time long past. We use *below* (Lat. *infra*) for later in a book, and *above* (Lat. *supra*) for that which precedes. Lat. *vita superior* means *former life*, and *aetas superiorum* denotes *past*; also ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω (or ἐπέκεινα) χρόνοις signifies *in former*

times. On the other hand, the past is called in Hebrew: *front*, and the future: *back* (AJSL 24, 141, n. *). Drusius (1550–1616) and J. D. Michaelis (1668–1738) interpreted this Hebrew *upward* correctly as equivalent to *retro ad anteriora tempora* (see Hitzig-Steiner *ad loc.*).

Wellhausen says, *upward* must have the same meaning in both vv. 15 and 18, and any one who denies that *upward* means *forward* cannot expect any consideration of his exegesis. We must assume the risk. The interpretation denounced by Wellhausen is found in Luther's Bible, J. D. Michaelis' translation, Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, Hitzig's *Prophet. Bücher*, Ewald's *Propheten*², Kautzsch's AT¹; also in Siegfried-Stade's and Francis Brown's dictionaries as well as in VB. V. 18^a (v) is secondary, and the following date (φφ) is an erroneous tertiary addition (see below, n. 29).

(13) The poet invites comparison between two distinct periods in the past which are separated by the date on which the reconstruction of the Temple was begun, Sept. 1, 520 B.C. (cf. 1, 12; Zech. 4, 9; JBL 32, 109; 33, 161). The period before that date he pictures in v. 16, and the interval between Sept. 1 and Dec. 18 he treats in vv. 18. 19.

(14) An experienced farmer might be expected to estimate the amount of grain that had been threshed out, by looking at the size of a pile of straw and chaff. In dry seasons, however, the heads of the grain do not fill out, and the yield of grain in proportion to the straw is much less. An epidemic of disease or *rust* also affects both the quality and quantity. In the summers preceding Sept. 1, 520 B.C. the farmers, who came to store their grain after threshing, found their expectations only half met.

(15) Grapes were trodden in the upper vat of the wine-press; the juice flowed from it into a second vat from which it was drawn into jars and skins (see the cut on p. 68 of the translation of *Judges* in the Polychrome Bible; cf. EB 5312). Heb. *pûrâ* is sometimes used for the press itself (cf. Haupt's *Joel*, n. 59 and AJSL 24, 126). Here it refers to the receiving vat which a vine-dresser might approach with the expectation of drawing off a yield of fifty jars. But in a dry season the grapes shrivel and yield less juice. The seasons preceding 520 B.C. had proven more disastrous to grapes than to grain, and less than half the expected

yield of wine was produced. *Jars* after *fifty* is omitted in Hebrew, just as we say a *quarter* for the fourth part of a dollar, or as *tenner* is used for a ten-pound note, or *tierce* for the third part of pipe (126 wine-gallons). A Roman *amphora* (MLN 33, 432) held about six gallons, a Syriac *ḥābîṭā* (OLZ 18, 297; ZA 30, 99) about eight gallons. For Oriental store-jars cf. the cut on p. 42 of Müller-Simonis, *Du Caucase au Golfe Persique* (Washington, 1892).

(16) In the interval since Sept. 1 the drought had been broken, and the early rains of October-November had come in abundance to soften the sun-baked ground for plowing and seeding.

(17) Barley and wheat, the two winter grains, had been sown after the fall rains. A good harvest could be anticipated. The fields are generally sown in November-December (see Benzinger, *Hebr. Arch.* 130ⁱ; contrast Matthes, ZAT 21, 125). Sometimes the winter rains are delayed until January (EB 4008). The husbandmen cannot start ploughing before the autumnal rains have prepared the land for the reception of the seed. The ground becomes very hard during the dry season (DB 1, 48^b).

(18) Grain was stored in pits (cf. Jer. 41, 8 and JBL 38, 133, n. 3) or in dry cisterns hewn out of the rock (EB 85). In England a hole dug in a potato- or turnip-field, for storing potatoes, &c. during the winter, is called a *pit* (EB¹¹ 21, 659^b, l. 5). The rendering *barn* (which means originally *barley-place*, *bere-ern*) is misleading, as are also Marti's *Speicher* and Nowack's *Scheuer* (so, too, Wellhausen and Duhm) or J. D. Michaelis' *Kornboden*. There were no covered buildings for the storage of farm-produce in Palestine. For a description of the grain-pits of post-exilic Gibeah, three miles north of Jerusalem, see Albright, *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. IV, p. 27.

(19) The good vintage had already given proof of the changed fortunes.

(20) In vv. 15-19 Haggai appealed to the change in the tide of misfortune since work had begun on the Temple, as evidence of the contention that prosperity was directly dependent on the reconstruction of Jhvh's Temple. Therefore, so he implies, the people should hasten to work on it; the earlier its completion, the sooner will come the full measure of Jhvh's grant of prosperity.

(21) Dec. 18, 520 B.C. The two Hebrew months and three days, which had elapsed since the third poem (see n. 12 on III) was published, amount to two months and but one day in the longer months of the Julian calendar.

(22) Cf. 2, 20 and n. 16 on I.

(23) The questions in vv. 12. 13 were not actually submitted to the priests. It is but a literary device adopted by the poet (cf. JBL 32, 108, n. 4; also Reuss' AT 2, 546, n. 4). The people knew well what the decision of the priests would be, if they were consulted; see above, n. 6.

(24) *Torah* is elsewhere used to denote the Law and is so translated here by the Versions; but, used without the article here, it has the more original meaning of *instruction* or *decision* (cf. JBL 36, 259). The oldest codes of the Law, Ex. 20-23 (E) and 34, 10-26 (J) as well as the Deuteronomic Code and the laws of Ezekiel, perhaps also the Law of Holiness (Lev. 17-26) were doubtless known, and more or less authoritative, at this time; but such incidents as this show that the Law was still living and growing. The priests rendered decisions which might afterwards be codified.

(25) According to Haupt (JBL 36, 149) the addition which is found in the Greek after 2, 14, consists of three glosses, the original Hebrew text of which should have been translated:—(a) *because of their acceptance of bribes*;—(b) *and they were grieved because of their labor*;—(c) *and their hatred of a pleader in the gate*. Gloss *b* belongs to end of IV, vi while he assigns *a* and *c* to Zech. 8, 16. See below, n. 28.

(26) V. 17 is an illustrative quotation which is a loose reproduction of Am. 4, 9. It is rejected by nearly all critics, since it mentions grain-diseases which arise from excessive moisture, whereas the genuine words of Haggai refer to drought; cf. I, 10. 11.

(27) These words are a euphemistic liturgical appendix to avoid the ominous conclusion *unbearing*.

(28) See above, n. 25. Haupt who holds that Zech. 8, 9-17 is Haggaiian (JBL 32, 107; 33, 161), believes that Zech. 8, 9-17 is a sequel to Hag. 2, 14-19 and was once written in a column parallel to it. Glosses σσ and ττ, having been inserted between the two columns, afterwards crept into the wrong column.

(29) Lit. *in the gate*, i.e. *who pleads with a court in favor of a (poor) defendant*.

(30) This date (Dec. 18, 520 B.C.) cannot refer to the following phrase *The time from the day when the Temple was founded*, since that occurred about Sept. 1; see above, n. 13. It is an addition based on the date given in 2, 10 (α) and is rejected by Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, Duhm and Budde.

CRITICAL NOTES

חני, adjectival in form, means *festal* (GK § 86, i; ZDMG 63, 520, l. 11). The name may also be explained as a shortening of חנייה (1 Chr. 6, 15) or of חגריה, as Zaccai (Zacchaeus) is a contraction of Zechariah (cf. JAOS 22, 101; BA 3, 566). Daiches (OLZ 11, 276) regards it as a mixed name, Hebrew in outer covering and Babylonian in content. *Ha-a-ag-ga-a* is found twice in the Murašû contract tablets. The name is not uncommon among the Hebrews, being found in the Talmud and borne by approximately a dozen different men mentioned in the Elephantine papyri where it is exceeded in frequency only by *Hosea*, *Meshullam* and perhaps *Nathan* and *Shallum*.

8

(i) For מ לא עת בא עת read עת בא עת following Ο οὐχ ἔκει οὐ καὶρός, V *nondum venit tempus*, T *usquequo non veniet tempus*, S לא מתי וקא, C לא מָטא עָנן. Ehrlich's reading לא עת־קנות, בית יהיה, with excision of להבנות at the end, and Grätz's עיר בא for מ עת־בא, adopted in Oort's *Emendationes*, are both unacceptable.

For מ העת לבן C has הכדין כשר לבן, *is it thus fitting for you?*

For מ קפונים (C κοιλοστέατοις, T *caelatis*, V *laqueatis*, C די מטללין בנסרי ארויא, *which are roofed with planks of cedar*) we must read קפונים; cf. 1 K 6, 15 and στέγη, *roof*; στέγος, *house*. Contrast *Kings* 163, 32. Ehrlich's emendation צפונים, co-ordinated to אתם, is gratuitous; but the rendering *covered* (roofed) *houses* in Reuss' AT (1892) is better than the translation *ceiled* (i.e. *wainscoted*) *houses*.

(ii) Ehrlich admits that v. 7^b should be followed by v. 9.

For **מ** לְבַבְכֶּם **Θ**VS have τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, *corda vestra*, לביתכן (so throughout the book) and some critics (cf. ICC *ad loc.*) might feel tempted to read לְבַבְכֶּם; but the plural would be contrary to Hebrew usage (cf. GK²⁸ § 124, s). It would be just as unidiomatic as if a German translator used the plural for our *physics, mathematics, acoustics, gallows, headquarters*. **Θ** has ξύλα (**ש** קישא) for עץ, Hag. 1, 8; ἔργα for מלאכה, 1, 14; θρόνους for כסא, 2, 22; **Σ** παρία for יבילה, 1, 10; **Υ** jumenta for הבהמה, 1, 11; cf. last note on π. Kittel notes *ad* Lam. 3, 41 that many MSS read לבבני instead of לבבנו, and that the plural is supported by **Θ**VS; but לבבני (we should expect at least לבבותי; cf. Franz Delitzsch's translation of Acts 14, 17) is as incorrect as **מ** לְבַבְכֶּן (Nah. 2, 8) for לְבַבְכֶּן (contrast *Nah.*, 46). It is sufficient to refer to the concordances *s.* לָבָם and לְבַבְכֶּם or לְבָבְכֶם and לְבַבְכֶּם.

Not only לב is used in the singular, even in cases where it refers to a number of persons, but also קרב, נפש, רוח, פה, and this usage prevails also in Assyrian. Gen. 42, 28 we read וַיֵּצֵא לָבָם (**Θ** καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, *Graec. Ven.* ἐξῆλθεν ἡ σφῶν καρδία, **Σ** ואל לבחן). Similarly we find in Assyrian: *iplax libbašunu*, their heart feared, or *ikpuḍ libbašunu*, their heart planned.

We often find αἱ καρδίαι in NT where OT has the singular לב; cf. *e.g.* Mal 3, 24 and Luke 1, 17; Jer. 31, 33² and Heb. 10, 16; Ps. 95, 8 and Heb. 3, 8. 15. **Θ** has καρδίαν πατρός πρὸς υἱόν for **מ** לב אבות ואיל בנים in Mal. 3, 24, **Υ** *cor patrum ad filios*, **Σ** לבא אבהא על בנא, **Θ** לב אבהן על בנין. Joel (2, 13) says קרעו לבבכם ואל בנדיכם; **Θ** has τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, **Υ** *corda vestra*, **Σ** לביתכן. It is idiomatic Hebrew to say לב בני אדם, לב חכמים, עשו לכם לב, אל תשיבו לב, חדש רוח חדשה, פי רשעים, הכינו לב, נתתי להם לב, שמו לבם, אל תשיבו לב, סערו לבכם. The singular ἡ καρδία instead of the plural αἱ καρδίαι is found also in the NT; cf. *e.g.* Luke 1, 66; 8, 12; 24, 32. 38 where **Υ** renders: *et posuerunt in corde suo; tollit verbum de corde eorum; nonne cor nostrum ardens erat; but cogitationes ascendunt in corda vestra*. Cf. also John 12, 40; 14, 1; I John 3, 20.

Ehrlich thinks we ought to read פָּנָה אֶל הָרֶבֶה, *ye made room for much* (Gen. 24, 31). It was not necessary for the people to make room for the harvest; they had plenty of garners (cf. n. 18 on IV) and they were not full. Moreover, we should expect at least פָּנָה לְהָרֶבֶה. The phrase פָּנָה אֶל הָרֶבֶה means lit. *to turn the face towards much*, i.e. *to look for in anticipation*.

For מִיָּהוָה הֵנָּה GCS suggest וְהִיא, but V has *ecce*. The ל is emphatic; cf. n. 3 to Haupt, *The Book of Ecclesiastes in Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894), p. 264; see also GK § 143, e; VG 1, 501, b; JBL 29, 104; 35, 289; AJP 40, 71, n. 27; לִמְעַט is practically equivalent to our *precious little*.

Read בִּיתָה; מִבֵּית הַבַּיִת is due to הַבַּיִת in the preceding verse. מִבֵּית הַבַּיִת is a conditional clause (GK § 159, g).

אֲנִי שָׁלַח בֵּיהּ מֵאֲרָתָא T is correctly interpreted by T נִפְחַתִּי בּוֹ, *I cast upon it a curse*. For נִפַּח, *blow, curse*, cf. Job 4, 9 where AV translates נִשְׁמַח by *blast*; רוּחַ, *wrath*, in Jud. 8, 3; Is. 25, 4; 30, 28; Zech. 6, 8 (JBL 32, 112, n. 19); Prov. 16, 32; 29, 11; אָף means *heavy breathing*, also *wrath*; Syr. אֲתִנְפַּח, *to be blown upon or away* signifies also *to be blasted*.

For בּוֹ in בִּיתָה cf. Lat. *afflare* and JBL 32, 112, n. 19; AJP 40, 70, n. 23.

(iii) For מִיָּהוָה הֵנָּה נָאִם יְהוָה T has διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει Κύριος. But there is a pause after יְהוָה. V, correctly, *Quam ob causam? dicit Dominus*. For the two beats of יְהוָה, see AJS 19, 130, last line. Cf. וְרִבְבָּל in the second hemistich of 2, ii.

For מִיָּהוָה הֵנָּה T has διώκετε. The following ל has the connotation of *for the benefit of*. For רוּץ, *to run*, be zealous, cf. Is. 59, 7; Prov. 1, 16; 6, 18; GB¹⁶ 752^a; see also above, p. 162, l. 16. Ehrlich cites Ber. 28^b: אֲנִי רֹץ לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, *I strive for life in the world to come* (BT 1, 104, l. 4). We must not read בְּבִיתִי רִצִּים (so Wellhausen, also Duhm, ZAT 31, 108). Nor can we adopt Cheyne's emendation רִצִּים (Crit. Bibl. 179).

(iv) After וְעַל כֵּן omit מִיָּהוָה (V, *super vos*) following G. T has וְעַל כֵּן חֹבִיבִינָא therefore on account of your sins. מִיָּהוָה originated as a gloss after וְעַל כֵּן in the following line, and later

was transferred to the preceding line because of its resemblance to על-כן.

For **M** מטל (**G** ἀπὸ δρόσου, **S** מן טאלא) we must read מטלם; cf. **Ṣ**. **Ṭ** has מלאחתא מטרא, *from sending rain*. Delitzsch (LSAT 12, m) thinks that the prefixed מ in **M** מטל is due to dittography. Grätz's reading מקל instead of מטל is not good.

For **M** ואקרא **G** has καὶ ἐπάξω.

For **M** חרב **GS** have ῥομφαίον, חרבא, *gladium* (= חרב).

For **M** על in the third line of this triplet, read the archaic form עלי. Haupt reads also עמי, מעי wherever the rhythm requires it; see JBL 38, 151, n. 10.

(v) For **M** והבאתם (**Ṭ** ונאתו, **S** איתו, **V** portate), read ובראתם, following **G** κόψατε and **Ṭ** caedite; בראתם may have been corrupted to הבאתם, but not *vice versa*. Ehrlich retains **M**. Grätz (*Emend.*) suggests והטבתם, but this would not have been corrupted to והבאתם.

The Dageš in ארצה-בי is due to the enclitic character of בו; cf. Haupt, JBL 36, 251ⁱ, *ad* v. 9; 37, 216, v. 2; GK²⁸ § 20, g, l. 7; G²⁹ 66; BuL 188. 199; VG 570, c.

The *Kētib* ואכבד is preferable to the *Qērē* ואכבדה. Note also that אנכדה would become in pause אנכרה. For the meaning *I shall manifest my glory* cf. the translation of Lev. 10, 3 in the Polychrome Bible; also Ezek. 28, 22; Is. 26, 15. According to Morgenstern (ZA 25, 141–153 and the *Haupt Anniversary Volume*, p. 98) כבוד יהיה is a technical term used by Ezekiel and P to designate the semi-material form assumed by Jhvh in revealing himself to mortals. To Ehrlich, אנכר means here *I shall feel amply rewarded*.

After **M** יהיה **S** adds חלקתא.

(α) We must not insert לאמר אמר-נא following **G** λέγων Εἰπόν and 2, 1. 2 and 20. 21; **M** לאמר אמר-נא should also be omitted in 2, 1. 2. In 2, 20. 21 (יהי דבר יהיה אל חגי) the insertion of לאמר אמר is correct, but in 1, 1 and 2, 1. 2 (יהי דבר יהיה ביד חגי אל ורכבל) it is superfluous. Cf. Budde's remarks in ZAT 26, 9; also note on ד, α.

(β) **M** לאמר is lacking in **GS**.

(δ) Oort's emendation בבתיכם instead of בבתים is unnecessary, if we read במקוים and regard בתיכם as a gloss.

(ζ) Read לשבע for **M** לשבעה.

Grätz (*Emend.*) suggests בו for **M** לו, following **G** καὶ οὐκ ἐθερμάνυντε ἐν αὐτοῖς, but **M** means: A man would clothe himself without feeling warm; cf. Haupt's remarks on impersonal constructions in his paper *The Son of Man in Mon.* 29, 126. Lange in his *Bibelwerk* (1876) gives the correct translation *aber nicht zum Warmwerden für einen*.

Omit **M** המשתכר as a gloss and read ישתכר (so several MSS; cf. ZAT 26, 11) for **M** משתכר. Cf. *Leviticus* 26, 40; *Kings* 289, 20.

Ehrlich's view that הָבָא in the second hemistich of v. 6 does not mean *to bring in*, but *to produce*, is unfounded; cf. 2 S 9, 10. We do not find אשר תביא האדמה in v. 11.

(π) In **M** על-אשר insert כל, following **GS** and many MSS.

M האדם is a collective noun; **GSV** have the plural. Similarly בהמה; cf. above, p. 177, l. 9.

(ξ) V. 13 or portions of it are rejected by nearly all critics. The epithet יהוה מלאך in ξ for the usual נביא suggests that 13^a is an interpolation; but 13^b is a fitting conclusion for the first poem (cf. ZAT 26, 13).

(ο) Ehrlich's view that כל שארית העם does not include the people who had returned from Babylon is untenable; שארית denotes the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. In Maccabean texts it refers to the Jews who had survived the Syrian persecution; cf. Haupt's translation of Ps. 76, 11 (ZDMG 61, 287, l. 20; 286, l. 28). Zeph. 3, 13, cited by Ehrlich, is Maccabean (cf. JBL 38, 147, l. 13) and שארית ישראל at the beginning of that verse is a later addition.

(ππ) For **M** פחת **G** has ἐκ φυλῆς, an attempt to see in the strange word פחת some form related to the more familiar ממשפחת. **C** likewise inserts בית. Heb. פחת is the Assyr. *bêl pixâti*, lord of a district, and *paxâtu*, governor (AJSL 24, 131; AkF 6). Cf. above, p. 165, l. 12. In Hebrew we have secondary doubling of the *h*:

pābhā, pabhāt; cf. *ābhād*, one, constr. *abhād*; also *abhīm*, brothers, *ābhāu*, his brothers (BuL §§ 24, g; 21, n; contrast AkF 6).

(טט) Insert פחת יהודה following **GS** and parallels in 1, 1. 14; 2, 2.

(פף) Read ואל for **M** ועל after ישמע.

For כִּשְׁלֹחַו, *as he commanded him to speak*, cf. Prov. 26, 6; 2 S 11, 22; 1 K 14, 6; Is. 55, 11. Grotius says: *Sicut misit Dominus, id est, quae Deus ei dicenda mandaverat, nam שלח Hebraeis saepe hanc significationem habet*. Cf. GB¹⁶ 832^a, e and JBL 26, 24, n. 7.

After **M** אלהיהם **GS** add אליהם. Its omission in **M** is due to haplography. We must not substitute אלהים for אלהיהם, as Ehrlich suggests.

2

For the Hebrew text of this quatrain see Haupt, JSOR 2, 77.

After **M** ארץ **G** adds καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν, an addition due to the resemblance of 2, 21 with 2, 6.

M ממלכות (**G** βασιλέων for βασιλειῶν) is an intensive plural; the great king (ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς) of Persia is called מלכים in Ps. 110, 5 (JSOR 2, 76) and in the same way the great Persian empire is called ממלכת. In the Sidonian inscriptions of the fourth century B.C. ממלכת means *king* (cf. JAOS 45, 272). **V** has the singular for ממלכות in ε. Also in **M** the plural forms מלכים, ממלכות, and מלכיות (*i.e.* מלכיות or מלכיות; cf. Albrecht, § 84, h) which were written מלכ', ממלכ', and מלכית', respectively (JBL 34, 81; 36, 252; AJSL 32, 74) are occasionally confounded; in Jer. 10, 7 Duhm and Cornill substitute מלכיהם (Θ, τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν αὐτῶν) for **M** מלכותם.

Insert כל before קח, following **GA**.

Read והאבדתי for **M** והפכתי which is due to vertical ditto-graphy; cf. Mic. 5, 9.

M מרכבה is a collective noun; cf. our *horse* for *cavalry*, and *foot* for *infantry*. **GS** read the plural. The word denotes the scythed chariots of the Persians, the δρεπανηφόρα ἄρματα of Xen. An. 1, 7, 10 and Diod. Sic. 17, 53 (JBL 37, 231, l. 3).

After **M** ורכביה **GA** adds καὶ καταστρέψω πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ καταβαλῶ τὰ ὄρια αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνισχύσω τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς μου. Cf. 1, σ; 7, μ. σσ. ττ.

Point יִקְרֶהוּ (hophal future of קרה, *to subdue*) instead of מ (perfect qal of ירד with ו consecutive). Cf. AJSJL 32, 70; JBL 34, 58; l. 9; also 38, 163¹. Grätz's emendation חררו is gratuitous.

Read רגלים, *footmen*, for מ ורכביהם which is dittography from the preceding hemistich; cf. Jer. 12, 5; WF 217, iii.

After אהיו Nowack (following Grätz) adds יפל; others prefer יפלו.

Duhm (ZAT 31, 110) regards איש בחרב אהיו as a secondary addition derived, perhaps, from Ezek. 38, 21; horses, he says, have no swords.

Ehrlich thinks we must evidently read תחתם, *instead of them* (*scil.* ממלכות) instead of מ כחותם, but this would be very prosaic, and תחתם would never have been corrupted to כחותם. Moreover, ממלכות denotes one kingdom, *viz.* the Persian empire, and even Haggai did not hope that Zerubbabel would become the supreme ruler of the Persian empire.

To מ כחותם C adds עליר which supports Haupt's suggestion that an original בימיני has been lost because of its resemblance to כירכך at the beginning of ו which follows.

(אא) Ehrlich says we must read הששי instead of בששי, but בששי is a tertiary addition, derived from א, α, as is also בשנת שתים which, according to Ehrlich, should be prefixed to א, ג.

2

(i) מ הנשאר is omitted in G^V I; G^S περιλειφθεῖς. For the article before the predicate cf. GK § 126, k. Since the allusion was to the well-known few who had seen the Solomonic Temple the use of the article is natural.

The plural ראים is an intended contrast with the singular ראה of the first line.

מ מה ומה means *what, and as what, not how*; מה גדול, *how great* = *what a great thing*. Cf. WdG 2, 314, l. 4; contrast GB¹⁶ 401, B. On the other hand, מי may mean *how*; see last note on ר, v.

Wellhausen's rendering of כְּמוֹהוּ כֵּאִין is correct; Heb. כְּמוֹהוּ can not mean simply *such a thing* (ZAT 26, 13; GB¹⁶ 330^b) or *such a one* (VB; JB). There is nothing contemptuous in כְּמוֹהוּ, as Lange in his *Bibelwerk* supposes. The literal translation would be *its likeness is the likeness of nothing*; cf. GK²⁸ § 161, c. In Arabic when we wish to say, *he is like a dog*, we must say (as in the Koran 7, 175) lit. *his likeness is like the likeness of the dog*; cf. KAT² 505; Fleischer, KS 1, 378. Even Rückert (1831) rendered incorrectly: *Ist nicht ein solches wie Nichts in euren Augen?* and Hitzig (1854): *Ist nicht Seinesgleichen wie keines in euren Augen?* Ewald's statement that older writers would have said הוּא כֵּאִין is unwarranted. The idiomatic כְּמוֹהוּ כֵּאִין and the two corrupt readings אֵין אַחֶם and מְהִיחֶם certainly do not indicate that Haggai was an old man (Ewald, *Proph.*² 3, 179).

(ii) For the hemistich וְכִבְבֵּל cf. first note on א, iii.

After הוּא יִהְיֶה נֶאֱמַר add צְבֻאוֹת with לו.

מ, misplaced in l. 2, should be restored as a plural before וְעָשׂוּ in l. 3.

(iii) Wellhausen's conjecture that מ, עוד אַחַת מֵעַתָּה הִיא represents the conflation of two variants, *I shall shake once more* and *I shall shake soon* is gratuitous. We must not delete אַחַת. G has ἔτι ἁπαλῶς = עוד אַחַת. Nor can we assume that S תִּבְּרָא זֶכֶן read עוד אַחַת פַּעַם or, rather, פַּעַם אַחַת. Heb. אַחַת means *once* (GK²⁸ § 134, r) just as Syr. חֲדָא may be used in this sense without the addition of זִבְנָא (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² § 241). Keil translated correctly: *noch einmal, und zwar in kurzem*. Orelli's explanation of אַחַת as *one period* of time is incorrect. G ἔτι ἁπαλῶς re-appears in Heb. 12, 26.

For מ, עוד G has ἔτι ὀλίγον in Ps. 37, 10, and ἔτι μικρόν in Ex. 17, 4. מ, עוד אַחַת מֵעַתָּה הִיא is expressed by T עוד חֲדָא וְעִירָא הִיא and U *adhuc unum modicum est*. The literal translation of the Hebrew phrase is, *again once a little it is*. Both עוד and אַחַת are adverbial, while מֵעַתָּה is an adjective used substantively as the subject of הִיא, *it is*. The whole phrase forms the first clause of the compound sentence, the second clause of which begins יֵאֵרֵךְ מְרִעִישׁ.

Ehrlich states that we must read **אם** instead of **אחת**. He thinks the **ם** of **אם** dropped out through haplography, and **א** was regarded as a symbol for **י**; **עוד** should be connected with **אמר** in **ז**: *for thus says Jhrsh furthermore, If it—the beginning of the reconstruction of the Temple—be insignificant, I shall shake up, &c.* For **אמר עוד** he refers to **ועוד ראיתי** and **עוד למד**, Eccl. 3, 16; 12, 9. But in both passages, which are secondary, **עוד** means *continually, constantly*; see Haupt's Eccl. 17. 33; cf. Ps. 84, 5^b. Duhm (ZAT 31, 109) thinks that **אחת** may mean *at once*; he compares **פתאם**, Mal. 3, 1, and is inclined to regard **מעט היא** as an explanatory gloss.

For **מ הרעשתי** which is due to **מרעיש** at the end of the first line of this triplet, read **השמרתי**; cf. note on **הפכתי** in **ב**, and JBL 35, 228.

Ehrlich thinks that **את-הים** was added because some of the treasures referred to at the end of this triplet came from the sea, **ההרבה** being added by way of supplement; contrast n. 7 on III.

Ehrlich's reading **הקבאי** instead of **מבאו** is no improvement; but he is right in deleting **כל-הגוים** after **ובאו**.

For **מ הקדחת** (so, too, **CSU**, **קדחת**, **קדחת**, **DESIDERATUS**) read **קדחת** following **Θ τα ελεαλας** and **ℒ electa**; so nearly all modern critics; note the prefixed plural **באו**. The reading **קדחת** with the addition **כל הגוים** is probably due to a subsequent Messianic interpretation; cf. Luke 2, 30. The original reading may have been **הקדחות** or **המדות** (cf. G²⁹ 45; also LSAT 62) and the omission of the **ו** before or after **ד** may be due to haplography (cf. JBL 37, 216, l. 9, and the last note but one on **ד**, vii). Cheyne's emendation **מנחת** for **קדחת** in the present passage (*Crit. Bibl.* 180) is gratuitous.

(iv) According to Ehrlich, **כבוד** does not mean *glory*, but *wealth*; but this is questionable; cf. his interpretation of **ואכבד** in **א**, v. Mitchell, too, renders: *wealth* instead of *glory*. For Morgenstern's treatment, see **א**, v.

The mistranslation in AV, *the glory of this latter house* (this would be **הבית האחרון הזה**) instead of *the latter glory of this house* (so RV) is retained in JB.

(α) Before שִׁאֲרִית prefix כל following **GS**; cf. 1, 12, 14.

(ε) V. 5^a is omitted in **GF** and is rejected by nearly all critics. **V** makes it the direct object of וַעֲשֵׂה in v. 4; כִּרְתִּי may stand for בִּרְתִּי. Perles (MVAG 22, 129) follows **V** in connecting וַעֲשֵׂה with אֶת־הַדְּבָר וְיִי. He thinks ε should be inserted after וַעֲשֵׂה and refers to עָשָׂה דְּבָר, Ps. 103, 20, עָשָׂה דְּבָר, Ps. 148, 8; but ε is prosaic, and the insertion of this clause would destroy the poetic form. Moreover, דְּבָר in connection with כִּרְתִּי does not mean *command* (1 K 13, 1; 20, 35) but *promise* (1 K 2, 4; 8, 20). **V** renders: *et facite (quoniam ego vobiscum sum, dicit Dominus exercituum) verbum quod pepigi vobiscum cum egrederemini de terra Aegypti*. Duhm (ZAT 31, 109) thinks that we may prefix וְאָקִים to אֶת־הַדְּבָר, but we may just as well supply וְזָכְרוּ; cf. Haupt, *Mic.* 6, 8; contrast Hitzig-Steiner's commentary, p. 328, l. 2. Grätz (*Emend.*) proposed to read אֶל הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כִּרְתִּי. The prefixed אֶת is certainly not the preposition אֶת, *with* (so Marti). Budde (ZAT 26, 14) regards אֶת as dittography of the last two letters of the preceding צִבְאוֹת; he prefers to read: הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כִּרְתִּי.

(σ) After **M** אֶתֵּן שְׁלוֹם נָאִם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת **G** adds καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχῆς εἰς περικύτους πάντας τὰς ἀναστῆσας τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, which **A** follows. According to Wellhausen, the Hebrew original of this gloss was נְשָׁלֵת נַפְשׁ לַחַיִּית כָּל הַיָּסֵד לְקוֹמָם, *and peace of mind to restore the whole foundation for re-erecting this Temple*. **G** read יָסֵד instead of יָסֵד. Wellhausen's reading יָסֵד has been adopted by Marti, Nowack, and Budde (ZAT 26, 14). But the כָּל before הַיָּסֵד would be strange; it would be more natural if it were prefixed to הַיָּסֵד. Sellin (cited by Nowack) regards περικύτους as a translation of מִקְהָה. This is preferable to לַחַיִּית, but instead of εἰς περικύτους we had better read καὶ περικύτους = וּמִחַיָּה; the ל should be prefixed to יָסֵד. According to Haupt, the ו before שְׁלוֹם is the ו explicative which often introduces glosses (GB¹⁶ 189^b, d; GK²⁸ 484, n. b; cf. *Pur.* 16, 19). We must therefore render this gloss to שְׁלוֹם, prosperity: *that is, peace of mind (security) and preservation (safety) for every one who lays the foundations for re-erecting this Temple*.

Budde (*loc. cit.*) proposed to prefix לְקוֹמָם to ו, so that the meaning would be: *and tranquillity of mind for the restoration of the whole foundation and the erection of this Temple*; but this is unsatisfactory. For the article in בְּלִיְהִיָּקָר cf. Num. 4, 47: בְּלִיְהִיָּבָא לַעֲבֹד, πᾶς ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος πρὸς τὸ ἔργον, *every one that came to serve*; Num. 21, 8: וְהָיָה כָּל הַנֶּשֶׁךְ וְרָאָה אֹתוֹ וְחָיָה, πᾶς ὁ δεδηγμένος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ζήσεται, *every one that is bitten, when he looks upon it, will live* (GK²⁸ § 127, b). Riessler restores the Hebrew (?) original of this clause as follows: וְשָׁלוֹם נַפְשׁ לְכָל עֹשֶׂה בְּקוֹמָם הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה (cf. n. 14 on I).

(17) Budde and Sievers prefer substitution of אֵל for בֵּיר to the excision of נָא: לֹא־אָמַר; cf. note on 8, α.

ד

(i) מִן was substituted for אִם (cf. 2, 13) probably by some Aramaic-speaking scribe.

(ii) Before מִן prefix יְקַדְּשׁוּ; the emphatic inf. abs. has often been omitted by the scribes; cf. e.g. JBL 38, 164, l. 2; also 170, v. 5, l. 2; 169, v. 15, l. 1; 168, v. 19, l. 3. The ו in יְקַדְּשׁוּ was omitted by haplography. The question is not, Is בְּשֵׁר־יְקַדְּשׁ holy? but, Are the things that come into contact with בְּשֵׁר־יְקַדְּשׁ holy?

For מִן וְיִאֲמָרוּ read וְיִאֲמָרוּ. The question is hypothetical: If you asked this question, you would receive a negative answer.

(iii) In טַמְאֵ-נַפְשׁ the נַפְשׁ is genitive (GK § 128, x). Heb. נַפְשׁ, *soul* means both *person* and *dead body*; cf. GB¹⁶ 515^a, a. d; Grimm's *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendices*, 5, l. 6, and JAOS 28, 116. For *person* = *body* (AJSJL 26, 1), cf. our *body-guard*, *body-servant* for *personal guard* or *attendant*. For *body* = *dead body*, cf. *corpse*, Lat. *corpus* and Ger. *Leiche* = Eng. *like* which meant originally *body*, then *dead body* (see JAOS 37, 255; cf. above, p. 171). Duhm's statement (ZAT 31, 110) that נַפְשׁ nowhere denotes a corpse is untenable; nor is it true that, as a rule, one can be defiled by another person only in case that person is dead; cf. e.g. Lev. 13, 45; 15, 5-8. 10. 11. 18. 19. 21-24. 27.

For וְיִאֲמָרוּ and וְיִעֲנוּ see second note on ii.

The omission of the plural ending in יַטְמְאִי at the end of this section may be due to haplography; in **M** it is followed by וַיַּעַן.

(iv) For the change in meter see above, p. 172, l. 14.

M אֲשֶׁר is the object of יִקְרִיבוּ, although **G** has καὶ ὅς ἐάν ἐγγίῃ-ἡσέ-εἰ, **L** et quicumque accesserit illo. According to Ehrlich, יִקְרִיבוּ is intransitive as in Ex. 14, 10; the whole clause is to be rendered *und wo sie hinfreten, da entsteht Unreinigkeit*. The traditional explanation, he says, deserves no refutation. But his interpretation, endorsed by Riessler (cf. n. 14 on I), is also unacceptable.

(v) **M** וּמַעְלָה, *and upward*, means *and backward*; cf. above, n. 12 on IV. Zeydner's reading לַמָּטָה (cited by Matthes, ZAT 21, 124) is impossible. Assyrian derivatives of עָלִי are commonly used of the past (HW 65, s. *ullānu*). The Jewish grammarians call a word accented on the ultima *milrā'*, i.e. accented *below*, while a word accented on the penult was termed *mil'él*, accented *above*, i.e. with the accent moved *backward* from the end toward the beginning of the word; cf. GK²⁸, p. 58, n. 3; G²⁹ § 12, b; contrast ZAT 27, 285; BuL §§ 12, a; 7, c.

As to וּמַעְלָה **G**^V has in Hag. 2, 15 ὑπεράνω (**G**^A ἐπάνω), and in v. 18 **G**^Γ has ἐπέκεινα. In 1 S 16, 13; 30, 25 **G**^V has ἐπάνω, and **G**^L, ἐπέκεινα. Both mean *previously*; they cannot mean *subsequently*; οἱ ἐπάνω (or ἐπέκεινα) χρόνοι denotes *the former times*. For the explanation of the addition וּמַעְלָה (omitted by **S**) in these two passages (where **C** has וְלַעֲלֹה, **V** et deinceps, and perpetually) see n. 12 on IV. In Hag. 2, 15, 18 **C** has וְלַעֲלֹה, **V** et supra in v. 15, but *et in futurum* in v. 18; also **S** has וְלָהֵךְ which means *forward, in the future*; the Last Judgment is called וְלָהֵךְ דְּלָהֵךְ; Syr. להל (Nöldeke, § 155, B) is the Heb. הִלָּאָה; הלך הלאה; stand back! (Gen. 19, 9) is in **S**: פָּרוּק לָהֵךְ.

There is no passage where וּמַעְלָה means *in the future* (contrast ZAT 26, 14ⁱ). Also in Qidd. 76^a (BT 5, 972, l. 9) וּמַעְלָה refers to οἱ ἐπάνω, *the ancestors*; cf. Levy's dictionary, vol. 3, p. 192^b; contrast Ber. 26^b; Pes. 50^b (BT 1, 97, l. 1; 2, 499, l. 6). Marti's rendering (*rückwärts*) of וּמַעְלָה, Hag. 2, 15 in Kautzsch's AT¹ (1894) was correct, and his translation (*die kommende Zeit*) in

AT³ (1910) is wrong. JB, *forward* (Ehrlich, *fürderhin*) is a step backward. J. D. Michaelis (1782) rendered correctly: *tut einen Rückblick in die vorige Zeit*.

According to Ehrlich מטרם is not Hebrew and is illogical. He thinks we must undoubtedly read מיום instead of מטרם. The traditional reading would imply that the people were to consider the entire time from the remotest past down to the beginning of the reconstruction of the Temple. This is indeed far-fetched. It is sufficient to point out that מטרם is preceded by מן היום הזה (cf. also Fleischer, KS 1, 622). But if any one hesitates to read מטרם, he may substitute בטרם. In the first and the fourth of the four Arabic versions of the Psalter, edited by Lagarde (cf. AJSL 2, 103, n. 1) we find in Ps. 90, 2 (cf. JBL 31, 121) instead of *قبل تكون الجبال* or *قبل تحبل الجبال* *ere mountains were brought forth*: *من قبل ان تكون الجبال* cf. also WdG 2, 189, B: *من قبل صلاة الفجر*, *before the morning prayer*, and Reckendorf § 247, f.

For the *enjambement* in the second lines of couplets v and vi see AJSL 23, 240 and *Nab.* 29, l. 14.

For the metrical restoration of this passage cf. Haupt, AJSL 24, 127.

מִהִיְיֹתָם is meaningless, either at the end of v. 15, or prefixed to v. 16 where מ and all the Versions place it. Ὡς τίς ἤτε correctly read מִי הִיְיֹתָם. For מִי, *how*, see BA 1, 17; AJSL 24, 127; contrast GB¹⁶ 419^a. The reading מִי הִיְיֹתָם (Kautzsch's AT¹, 1894, also AT³, 1910; cf. ZAT 26, 15) is preferable to מִהִיְיֹתָם (so Matthes, Oort, Marti, Nowack, Sievers, Duham, Ehrlich) or Sellin's emendation מִהִיְיֹתָם, *before they restored*. RV *through all that time* (retained in JB) is a paraphrase of AV *since those days were* rather than a translation of the Hebrew text. Matthes' reading מִהִיְיֹתָם (ZAT 23, 125ⁱ) is given in Gesenius' *Thes.* (1835), p. 375^a: *Hagg. II, 16 pro מִהִיְיֹתָם cum Alexandrino interpreter (τίς ἤτε) legendum videtur מִהִיְיֹתָם, i.e. מִהִיְיֹתָם pro מִהִיְיֹתָם*; cf. Köhler's *Haggai* (1860), p. 97, n. 1. Similarly Matthes' ספר השיר instead of ספר הישר (ZAT 23, 121) was suggested by J. D. Michaelis

in 1774; see Fürst³ 1, 559^bⁱ; Haupt, *AJSL* 20, 166, n. 26; *JHUC*, no. 316, 22ⁱ.

(vi) We need not read the inf. בא (so Marti, Ehrlich, Duhm); בא is impersonal; cf. second note on א, ז. AV *when one came* is correct. ⚡ ὅτε ἐνεβάλλετε εἰς κυψέλην κριθῆς εἴκοσι σάτα, καὶ ἐγένετο κριθῆς δέκα σάτα is not a literal translation, but a paraphrase; ערמה does not mean κυψέλη, nor need we add either סאים (cf. GK § 134, n) or שער (or שערים; Cod. 20 of de Rossi, חטים). ⚡ *cum accederetis ad acervum viginti modiorum, et fierent decem*, ⚡ מדהותן על כריא, ⚡ מדהותן עליו לערימת עסרון והוא עשרא, but דעשרין והוא עשרא (M מהיותם) must be joined to the preceding line.

For the insertion of הנה before היתה in the second hemistich cf. 1, 9.

For M פורה (omitted by S) read מפורה; the omission of the prefixed מ is due to haplography. ⚡ (πεντήκοντα μετρητάς), ⚡ (quinquaginta lagenas), ⚡ (amphoras) and ⚡ (המשין נרבין דהמר) take פורה to be a large jar for the storage of wine. The amphora of the Greeks and Romans was also a liquid measure, equal to about six gallons, Landersdorfer, *Sumer. Sprachgut im AT* (Leipzig, 1916), pp. 81. 49 regards פורה as a Sumerian loan word (cf. Haupt, *MLN* 33, 433ⁱ; *AJSL* 24, 126. 171; *ZDMG* 64, 714, l. 17; *AJP* 39, 309; *Joel*, n. 59). Heb. פורה is the fem. of Assy. *pûru*, urn. Our *vat*, formerly spelled *fat*, is the Ger. *Faß*, barrel, and *Faß* is also a measure of capacity (*JHUC*, no. 306, p. 25).

(vii) In למן the ל is governed by שימו לבבכם at the end of this line. ⚡ connect שימו לבבכם with the following line, but v. 19 is an independent question.

⚡ has for M ה: העוד הורע במי: εἰ ἐπιγνωσθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλω, הורע being misread הורע.

For M מגורה read ממרה as in *Joel* 1, 17 where ⚡ has θησαυροί. ממרה is a pit (silo) in which grain is stored, lit. *thrown down* (from מר, *Ps.* 89, 45; cf. *WdG* 1, 125, l. 2 and C, 4). It is not a *threshing floor* as ⚡ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλω and ⚡ באדרא (*ZDMG* 64, 705, l. 28) translate. Budde's reading במגן, *on the threshing floor*

(ZAT 26, 16ⁱ) is unacceptable. Nor can מַגִּירָה in this connection mean *object of fear* (so Zeydner, cited by Matthes, ZAT 21, 125). In Joel 1, 17 the plural of מַגִּירָה is written מִמַּגִּירָה; the ו of מִמַּגִּירָה in the present passage may be due to dittography of the ו (JBL 37, 216, l. 9).

For מ ו עֲרֵ read עֲרֵ following Ⲭ καὶ εἰ ἔτι and Ⲱ *et adhuc*; cf. Delitzsch, LSAT § 63^a, l. 4. The omission of ו before ע may be due to haplography.

We must not read נִשָּׂאָם, following Ⲭ τὰ οὐ φέροντα, instead of נִשָּׂא, as Delitzsch (LSAT 10, l. 5) suggests; if ο and π are eliminated, the singular is correct, and the perfect is preferable to the participle. In December the vintage is over. The fields were sown about November-December (see n. 17 on IV) and the grapes harvested about August-September. RV *yea* (AV adds *as yet*) *the vine has not brought forth* (retained in JB) is untenable.

(α) For בִּיד חֲנִי Ⲭ πρὸς Ἀγγαῖον we must not read בִּיד חֲנִי (so S and several MSS, also Marti and Kittel). See note on א, α.

(β) Scribal expansion, due to כִּנְפִי in the following hemistich. Ⲭ has not only ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ in the second hemistich, but also τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ in the third.

(γ) ו often introduces affixed glosses (GK § 154, a, n. 1; b; GB¹⁶ 189^b, d) or connects prefixed additions (*Est.* 83, δ; *Mic.* 112, η; 111, μ; 108, ν; JBL 36, 83, γ; 37, 231, ν; 38, 151, λ). The genuine וּמִן of v. 14 is the word commonly used for Gentiles, and the glossator may have considered בְּנֵי הָעַם more appropriate.

(δ) The first clause of this gloss appears in Ⲭ after v. 14 between the two clauses סס and טτ; cf. above, notes 25 and 28 on IV. Ⲭ ὁδυστηθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου πόνων αὐτῶν read וְיִנְי instead of וְיִנְי. Ⲭ has ὁδύτη for וְיִנְי in Gen. 44, 31; Pss. 13, 3; 107, 39. Ⲭ may also have read וְיִנְי; cf. ὁδυστηθήσονται for וְיִנְי (contrast ZDMG 66, 401) in Zech. 12, 10. G. A. Smith's restoration, וְיִנְי עֲבָדָהּם *they vex themselves with their* (profane) *labors*, is not good. Nor can we read וְיִנְי or וְיִנְי, as suggested by Sievers (*loc. cit.* 73ⁱ) who is inclined to insert this clause in v. 14 after

ריessler (cf. n. 14 on I) gives the following restoration of the Hebrew (?) text of this clause inserted between the two clauses of סס and טז: יען משאותיהם בקר יעברו מפני יגיעיהם: טז. ושנאתם בשערים מיביח. See Haupt, JBL 36, 149 and notes on סס and טז.

V. 17, according to Haupt, is a loose reproduction of Am. 4, 9 which he restores as follows:

בשדפון ובדקון []	הקיתי אתכם [כח־רבוין]
יאכל הגזם	גנותיכם וקרמיקם
נאם יהוה:	ולא שבתם עדי

(α) ותאניכם וזיתים

I smote you with a [drought], Your gardens (of fruit trees) and vineyards ^α Yet, ye did not return to Me,	with blasting and blight; [] the locusts devoured; declares Jhv̄h.
---	--

(α) and your fig trees and your olive trees.

מ instead of אינכם at the end of Hag, 2, 17 is no doubt due to the אתכם at the beginning of the verse. Why the glossator used אתם instead of שבם we cannot tell. In Ethiopic this verb means to *return*, while in Assyrian it means to *find* (Haupt, JSOR 1, 42). It is poetic in Hebrew, but common in Aramaic and Arabic. Oort (*Emend.*) reads ואינכם שבם (so, too, Budde, ZAT 26, 15) in the present passage, but this would not have been corrupted to אתכם ואין.

מ ברר in Hag, 2, 17 may be a correction of the corrupt הרבות of Am. 4, 9 (so, Haupt).

(סס) For מקחם שחר cf. 2 Chr. 19, 7; for the construction see GK²⁸ § 115, h. d; WdG 2, 60, A. Ἐνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αὐτῶν τῶν ὀρθρινῶν (I *propter praesumptiones eorum matutinas*) read שחר instead of שחר, but not לקחתם instead of לקחתם, as Wellhausen supposed.

(טז) For בשער מוכיח (καὶ ἐμισεῖτε ἐν πύλαις ἐλέγχοντες, I *et odio habebatis in portis arguentes*) read ושנאתם בשערם; the plural ending in בשערם is dittography of the initial מ

of מוכיח, and the plural πύλαις is responsible for **Θ** ἐλέγχοντας instead of ἐλέγχοντα (see Haupt, JBL 36, 149), cf. note on μ.

(φφ) Ehrlich says, we must either read **וּשְׁלַח** in the present passage or **בְּהַשִּׁיעַ** in **כ**, κκ.

INDEX

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1, 1 ^a : I, α | 2, 1. 2 : III, α, τε. υυ |
| 1 ^b : ππ | 3 : ι |
| 2 : ι, 1. 2. β | 4 : ii, 1. 2. 3. β. γ. δ |
| 3 : γ | 5 ^a : ε |
| 4 ^a : ι, 3. δ | 5 ^b : ii, 4 |
| 4 ^b : ε | 6 ^a : ζ |
| 5. 6 : ζ. ρρ. σσ | 6 : iii, 1. 2. η. θ. ι. κ |
| 7 ^a : η | 7 ^a : iii, 3. λ |
| 7 ^b : ii, 1 | 7 ^b : μ |
| 8 : ν, 1. 2. ν | 8 ^a : iv, 1 |
| 9 ^a : ii, 2. 3 | 8 ^b : ν |
| 9 ^b : iii | 9 : iv, 2. 3. ζ. ο. π. ρ |
| 10. 11 ^a : iv, ι. κ. λ | 10. 11 : IV, α. ρρ |
| 10 ^b : θ | 12 : ι, ii, β. γ. δ. ε. ζ |
| 11 ^b : μ | 13 : iii, η |
| 12 : ο. υυ. φφ | 14 : iv, θ. ι |
| 13 ^a : ζ. τε | 15 : ν, κ |
| 13 ^b : ν, 3 | 16 : vi, λ |
| 14 : ο. χχ | 17 : μ. υυ |
| 15 ^a : II, α | 18 ^a : ν. φφ |
| 15 ^b : κκ | 18 ^b : vii, 1. ζ |
| | 19 ^a : vii, 2. ο |
| | 19 ^b : π |
| | 20 : II, α. λλ. μμ |
| | 21 ^a : β |
| | 21 ^b . 22 : 1. 2. 3. γ. δ. ε |
| | 23 ^a : ζ |
| | 23 ^b : 4. ι. θ. ι |

2, 2. I (22) לאמר: אמר נא (vv) בן שלתיאל סחת יהודה ואל יהושע בן יהוצדק הכהן הגדול

7

יִאֲמִינוּעַ מִמָּא־נַפֶּשׁ בְּכֹל־אֱלֹהִי הַיִּשְׁמָאִין 13 iii
[וְיִ] עֲנוּ הַלְהָנִים [וְיִ] אָמְרוּ יִשְׁמָאֵין :

15 v ועתה שימורנא לבבכם מן־היום הזה ומעלה
מפרם שום־אבן * ע * ל־אבן בחבל | מ * י * ד * ה * י * ל * י * ת * א * מ * י *

יִלְמַן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָסַד	18 vii
הַעוֹד הַזֶּה בְּיַמ־מַגִּידָה	19

והתאנא והרמון ועץ הזית (o) 19
(π) מן היום הזה אכרך

17 (ט) את כל מעשה ידיכם 18 (פפ) מיום עשרים וארבעה לתשיעי

ב

2, 22. 2 I b	α ^β אני־מרעיש זשמים וי־ארץ	והפכתי כסא ממלכות
	והשמדתי כל־חזק הגוים	והאבדתי מרכבה ולכביה
	וני־דדו סוסים וריגל־ים	איש־בחרב אחיו י־פל:
23	י־אקחך זרבבל־י עבד־י	ושמתיך כחותם כימיני:
2, 20. I, 15 (α)	ביום עשרים וארבעה לחדש ^א <היכה> דבר יהודה אל חגיגן לאמר:	
21 (β)	אמר אל זרבבל פחת יהודה לאמר (γ) אתיה (δ) אתיה	
22 (ε)	ממלכות (ζ) 23 ביום ההוא נאם יהוה צבאות (η) בן שאלתיאל	
23 (θ)	נאם יהוה (i) כי כך בחרתי נאם יהוה צבאות	
I, 15 (κκ)	בשמי בשנת שנים לדרוש המלך	2, 20 (λλ) שנית
2, 20 (μμ)	בעשרים וארבעה לחדש	

ג

2, 3 i A	αמי־בכם הנשאך	אשר ראה
	את־הבית הזה	בכבודו הראשון
	ומה אתם	ראים־אתו עתה
	הלוא כמחו	כאין בעיניכם:
4 ii	ועתה חזק	זרבבל־י
	ו{{כל־עם הארץ	נאם־יהוה <צבאות>
	{חזקו־י} ועשו	כי־אני אתכם: <י>
5	ורוחי עמדת	בתוככם אל־תיראו:
6 iii B	עוד־אחת מעט־היא	ואני מרעיש
	ישמים וי־ארץ ^{1 2 3}	ויים וי־חרבה:
7	והשמידתי את־הגוים	ובאו <חמד־י> תי:
8 iv	לי הקסף	ול־י חזב־י:
9	גדול יהיה	כבוד הבית ^π :
	ובמקום הזה	אתן שלום־י:
2, 1 (α)	בשביעי בעשרים ואחד לחדש היה דבר יהוה ביד חגי הנביא	
2	אל זרבבל ^π ואל <כל> שארית העם לאמר:	(β) 4 נאם יהוה
4 (γ)	וחזק יהושע בן יהוצבק הכהן הגדול	(δ) נאם יהוה צבאות
5 (ε)	את־הדבר אשר כרתי אתכם בצאתכם ממצרים	
6 (ζ)	כי כה אמר יהוה צבאות (η) אתיה (θ) אתיה (i) אתיה (κ) אתיה	
7 (λ)	כל הגוים ומלאתי את הבית הזה כבוד אמר יהוה צבאות	(μ) כל
8 (ν)	נאם יהוה צבאות (ξ) 9 הזה (o) האחרון (π) מן הראשון אמר יהוה צבאות	

חגי

א

העם־הזה אמרו	אֶבְרָאִם יְהוָה ⁸	I, 2 i
בית־יהוה להבנות:	לֹא־עָתָּה בָּאֵתָה	
לשבת בַּיּוֹם וּבַיּוֹמִים:	זֹהָתָה לְכַס־אֶתֶם	4
על־דְּרָכֵיכֶם:	שִׁמּוֹ לְבַבְכֶם	7 ^b ii
והנה למעט	פְּנֵה אֶל־הָרֶבֶה	9 ^a
וְאֵנִי נִפְחַת־יָבוֹ:	והקִּאתֶם בִּיתָה ¹⁴¹³²	
נא־סִיְהוֹה צְבָאוֹת	יֵעַן מָה	9 ^b iii
אֲשֶׁר־הוּא חָרֵב	יֵעַן בֵּיתִי	
אִישׁ לְבִיתוֹ:	וְאַתֶּם רָצִים	
שְׁמִים שְׁלֹשׁ ¹²³ :	עַל־כֵּן } כֻּלָּאֵו	10 iv
על־אָרֶץ וְהָרִים	וְאֶקְרָא { 'י } חָרֵב	11
וְעַל־יְהוָה הַתִּירוּשָׁ:	וְעַל־יְהוָה הַדָּגֵן	
וְכִי־אֵתֶם עֵץ	עָלּוּ הָהָר	8 v
וְאַרְצָה־בּוֹ וְאַפְקָדִי:	וּבְנוּ הַבֵּית	
נא־סִיְהוֹה צְבָאוֹת:	אֲנִי אֶתְכֶם	13 ^b

1, 1 (α) בשנת שנים לדְרוֹשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּחֹדֶשׁ הַשָּׁנִי בְּיוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ הָיָה דְבַר יְהוָה
 בִּיד חֲנִי הַנְּבִיא אֶל זְרַבְבָּלָאֵם לֵאמֹר: 2 (β) צְבָאוֹת לֵאמֹר
 וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה בִּיד חֲנִי הַנְּבִיא לֵאמֹר: 4 (δ) בְּתוֹכֶם (ε) וְהַבֵּית הַזֶּה חָרֵב
 וְעַתָּה כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

5 (ζ)
 שִׁמּוֹ לְבַבְכֶם
 זְרַעְתֶּם הָרֶבֶה
 אֶכּוֹל וְאֵינִי־שָׂבֵעַ (pp)
 אֶל־צִדּוֹר נָקִיב:

6
 7 (η) כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת 10 (θ) וְהָאָרֶץ כֻּלָּאֵה יִבּוֹלֶהָ (ι) עֲלֵיכֶם (κ) 11 ה
 עֲלֵיהָ 11 (λ) (μ) וְעַל הַיִּצְהָר וְעַל כָּל־אֲשֶׁר תּוֹצִיא הָאֲדֹמָה וְעַל הָאֲדָם וְעַל
 הַבְּהֵמָה וְעַל כָּל יִגִּיעַ כְּפִים:

13^a (ξ) וַיֹּאמֶר חֲנִי מִלֵּאָדָּה יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְעַם לֵאמֹר
 וַיִּשְׁמַע זְרַבְבָּלָאֵם וְכָל שְׂאִרֵּית הָעָם בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וַיִּירָאוּ הָעָם מִפְּנֵי
 יְהוָה: וַיַּעַר יְהוָה אֶת רוּחַ זְרַבְבָּלָאֵם וְאֵת רוּחַ כָּל שְׂאִרֵּית הָעָם וַיָּבֵאוּ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
 מִלֵּאָכָה בְּבֵית יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם:

1, 1 (ππ) בֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־סֶחַת יְהוָה וְאֵל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֵּן יְהוֹנָדָּק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל 6 (pp) שְׁתֵּי וְאֵין לְשִׁכְרָה
 הַמִּשְׁתַּכֵּר 6 (σσ) 13^a (ττ) בְּמִלֵּאכּוֹת יְהוָה 12 (υυ) בֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־סֶחַת יְהוָה אֶל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֵּן יְהוֹנָדָּק
 הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (φφ) וְאֵלֶּה דְבַר חֲנִי הַנְּבִיא כַּאֲשֶׁר שִׁלְחַו יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם אֶלֵיהֶם
 14 (xx) בֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־סֶחַת יְהוָה וְאֵת רוּחַ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֵּן יְהוֹנָדָּק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל

VITA

THE writer was born on January 28, 1888, in Altoona, Pennsylvania, and attended the public schools of that city until 1905 when he entered Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Penna. After receiving the degree of Bachelor of Arts from that institution in 1909, he spent three years at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Penna. The following year was spent in business pursuits and during part of this year he taught in the Altoona High School. In 1913 he entered the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University and for four years and a half pursued post-graduate study under the late Professors Haupt and Ember, together with Drs. Blake and Rosenau, to all of whom and to Dr. Albright and President Morgenstern he wishes to express his appreciation of assistance given in the preparation of this dissertation.

PRINTED IN AUSTRIA

ADOLF HOLZHAUSEN'S SUCCESSORS
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY
VIENNA